arXiv:1208.2109v2 [quant-ph] 30 Aug 2012

# Comment on the "Classical and quantum position-dependent mass harmonic oscillators" and ordering-ambiguity resolution

Omar Mustafa*
*Department of Physics, Eastern Mediterranean University, G. Magusa, north Cyprus, Mersin 10 - Turkey,*
*Tel.: +90 392 6301078; fax: +90 3692 365 1604.*

Cruz and coworkers (Phys. Lett. A 369 (2007) 400) have considered the classical and quantum position-dependent mass harmonic oscillators. In their general considerations of the "quantum position-dependent mass oscillator", the harmonic oscillator's creation and annihilation operators were only used in the oscillator's commutation relation $[\hat{A}^-, \hat{A}^+] = 1$ to obtain two Hamiltonians $\hat{H}^+ = \hat{A}^+\hat{A}^-$ and $\hat{H}^- = \hat{A}^-\hat{A}^+$. Apart from their wrong results (namely, equations (28) and (30), to be corrected herein), they should have had used the oscillator's complementary relation $\hat{H} = \hat{H}^+ + 1/2 = \hat{H}^- - 1/2$ that yields one unique oscillator Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. Consequently, a unique representation of the kinetic energy operator would have been obtained to, very likely, represent an ordering-ambiguity resolution for the von Roos Hamiltonian.

**Keywords:** Position-dependent-mass, ordering-ambiguity parameters, Classical and quantum correspondence.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this comment, we consider the work of Cruz et al. [1] and point out the wrong results reported therein. In section II, we discuss their quantum position-dependent mass (PDM) oscillator (in their section 3.1) and show that when the harmonic oscillator's creation $\hat{A}^+$ and annihilation $\hat{A}^-$ operators are used, they have not only to satisfy the commutation relation $[\hat{A}^-, \hat{A}^+] = 1$ but also they have to satisfy the well known complementary condition on the oscillator Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{A}^+\hat{A}^- + 1/2 = \hat{A}^-\hat{A}^+ - 1/2$. Such a condition would result a unique quantum PDM oscillator Hamiltonian, unlike Cruz et al.'s [1] claimed arbitrariness in the quantum PDM oscillator (in their section3.3). Moreover, in section III we use a point canonical transformation (PCT) and show that such unique quantum PDM oscillator Hamiltonian represents the quantum mechanical correspondence of the classical PDM oscillator Hamiltonian.

As long as the ordering-ambiguity [1–17] associated with the PDM von Roos Hamiltonian [2] (equation (2) below) is concerned, we observe from the results of sections II and III that one "*unique*" ordering-ambiguity parametric set $j = l = -1/4$ ($= a$ of Cruz et al. [1]) and $k = -1/2$ ($= 2b$ of [1]) is obtained (namely, Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's [4] ordering-ambiguity parametric set). To show that such parametric set is not only a manifestation of the quantum PDM oscillator Hamiltonian, we also consider the classical and quantum mechanical correspondence for quasi-free PDM particles moving under the influence of their own PDM force fields.

## II. QUANTUM POSITION-DEPENDENT MASS HARMONIC OSCILLATOR

Very recently, Cruz et al. [1] have considered the classical and quantum position-dependent mass (PDM) harmonic oscillators. In their general considerations of the "quantum position-dependent mass oscillator" (see section 3 of their paper), they have used a PDM Hamiltonian of the form

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2} m(x)^{\boldsymbol{a}} \, \partial_x m(x)^{2b} \, \partial_x m(x)^a + V(x) \;\; ; \;\; a + b = -\frac{1}{2}. \tag{1}$$

Which is in fact obtained from the PDM von Roos Hamiltonian (cf. e.g., [1–17])

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ m(x)^{\boldsymbol{j}} \, p_x m(x)^k \, p_x m(x)^l + m(x)^l \, p_x m(x)^k \, p_x m(x)^j \right] + V(x), \tag{2}$$

where the ordering-ambiguity parameters $j$, $k$, and $l$ are subjected to von Roos constraint $j + k + l = -1$. They have also used the continuity conditions at the abrupt heterojunction between two crystals which suggests that $j = l$. Then, $j = l = a$ and $k = 2b$ are the parametric mappings between their Hamiltonian (1) and Hamiltonian (2).

---

*Electronic address: omar.mustafa@emu.edu.tr

Their construction of the harmonic oscillator creation

$$\hat{A}^{+}=-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}m^{a}\partial_{x}m^{b}+W_{a}\left(x\right), \tag{3}$$

and annihilation

$$\hat{A}^{-}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}m^{b}\partial_{x}m^{a}+W_{a}\left(x\right), \tag{4}$$

operators have led them to two Hamiltonians

$$\hat{H}^{+}=\hat{A}^{+}\hat{A}^{-}=-\frac{1}{2}m^{a}\partial_{x}m^{2b}\partial_{x}m^{a}+V_{a}^{+}\left(x\right)=\hat{T}_{a}^{+}+V_{a}^{+}\left(x\right), \tag{5}$$

(i.e., equation (25) of their paper) and

$$\hat{H}^{-}=\hat{A}^{-}\hat{A}^{+}=-\frac{1}{2}m^{b}\partial_{x}m^{2a}\partial_{x}m^{b}+V_{a}^{-}\left(x\right)=\hat{T}_{a}^{-}+V_{a}^{-}\left(x\right), \tag{6}$$

(i.e., equation (26) of their paper). Where their $V_{a}^{+}\left(x\right)$ and $V_{a}^{-}\left(x\right)$ are defined in equations (27) and (28) of their paper, respectively. At this point, the last term in their expression for $V_{a}^{-}\left(x\right)$ in (28) should be removed (no such term should be there) and consequently their corresponding $V_{a}^{\pm}\left(x\right)$ in (30) should read

$$V_{a}^{\pm}\left(x\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\int^{x}\sqrt{m\left(u\right)}du\right)^{2}-\frac{\left(4a+1\right)^{2}}{8}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^{\prime}\right]^{2}\mp\frac{\left(4a+1\right)}{4}\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^{\prime\prime}\mp\frac{1}{2}. \tag{7}$$

Obviously, our third term in (7) does not agree with their second term in (30). Indeed one would use the oscillator commutation relation $[\hat{A}^{-},\hat{A}^{+}]=1$ to obtain $W_{a}\left(x\right)$ given in their equation (29). However, the harmonic oscillator is also well known to have one unique Hamiltonian given by the complementary relation

$$\hat{H}=\hat{A}^{+}\hat{A}^{-}+\frac{1}{2}=\hat{A}^{-}\hat{A}^{+}-\frac{1}{2}. \tag{8}$$

This would, in turn, suggest that the corresponding kinetic energy operators satisfy the relation

$$\hat{T}_{a}^{+}=\hat{T}_{a}^{-}\Longrightarrow-\frac{1}{2}m^{a}\partial_{x}m^{2b}\partial_{x}m^{a}=-\frac{1}{2}m^{b}\partial_{x}m^{2a}\partial_{x}m^{b}. \tag{9}$$

Clearly, this relation can only be satisfied if and only if $a=b$. This result, when substituted in the corresponding von Roos constraint $a+b=1/2$, would immediately imply that $a=b=-1/4$. Consequently, The quantum harmonic oscillator PDM-Hamiltonian in (8) is unique and represented by

$$\hat{H}=-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m}}\partial_{x}\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\partial_{x}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m}}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\int^{x}\sqrt{m\left(u\right)}du\right)^{2}. \tag{10}$$

Unlike Cruz et al.'s [1] claimed arbitrariness (in their section 3.3) in the quantum PDM oscillator, this result not only shows that one unique quantum PDM oscillator's Hamiltonian is obtained but also exactly represents the quantum mechanical correspondence of the classical PDM harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian given in their equation (5). We discuss this in the following section.

## III. HARMONIC OSCILLATOR CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM MECHANICAL CORRESPONDENCE: POINT CANONICAL TRANSFORMATION

Let us consider a classical PDM-particle moving under the influence of a potential field $V\left(x\right)$. Then the corresponding Hamiltonian would read

$$\mathcal{H}_{x}.=\frac{p_{x}^{2}}{2m\left(x\right)}+V\left(x\right)=\frac{1}{2}m\left(x\right)\,\dot{x}^{2}+V\left(x\right)\;\;;\;\;\dot{x}=\frac{dx}{dt}. \tag{11}$$

Which, under PCT

$$q'(x)=\sqrt{m(x)}\Longrightarrow q(x)=\int^{x}\sqrt{m(u)}du, \tag{12}$$

would be transformed into $\mathcal{H}_q$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_q=\frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^2+V(q(x))\ \ ;\ \dot{q}=\frac{dq}{dt}. \tag{13}$$

Where $\mathcal{H}_q$ represents a classical particle with a "*constant unit mass*" moving under the influence of a potential field $V(q)$ with a momentum $P_q=\dot{q}$. We may now safely recollect that $\mathcal{H}_q$ can be factorized into

$$\mathcal{H}_q=a^-a^+=a^+a^-=\frac{1}{2}P_q^2+V(q), \tag{14}$$

such that

$$a^{\pm}=\mp i\frac{P_q}{\sqrt{2}}+G(q), \tag{15}$$

satisfy the Poisson bracket

$$\left\{a^-,a^+\right\}=\frac{\partial a^-}{\partial P_q}\frac{\partial a^+}{\partial q}-\frac{\partial a^-}{\partial q}\frac{\partial a^+}{\partial P_q}=i \tag{16}$$

for the harmonic oscillator with a "*constant unit mass*". This condition on $a^{\pm}$ would yield that

$$\frac{dG(q)}{dq}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Longrightarrow G(q)=\frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}\Longrightarrow V(q)=\frac{1}{2}q^2=\frac{1}{2}\left(\int^{x}\sqrt{m(u)}du\right)^2. \tag{17}$$

Of course, for a given PDM $m(x)$ one may then find the corresponding $V(x)$. However, this readily lies far beyond our current proposal.

Moreover, the quantum mechanical correspondence of such a classical model would transform Hamiltonian (1), using substitution $\psi(x)=m(x)^{1/4}\varphi(q)$ in $\hat{H}\psi(x)=E\psi(x)$, into

$$\hat{H}_q=-\frac{1}{2}\partial_q^2+V_{eff}(q(x))=\frac{1}{2}\hat{P}_q^2+V_{eff}(q), \tag{18}$$

where $\hat{P}_q=-id/dq=-i\partial_q$ analogous to the linear momentum operator for a quantum particle with a *constant unit mass,*

$$V_{eff}(q)=\frac{1}{8}(1+4b)F_1(q)-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{9}{16}+a(a+2b+1)+2b\right]F_2(q)+\tilde{V}(q), \tag{19}$$

and

$$F_1(q)=\frac{m''(x)}{m(x)^2}\ \ ;\ \ F_2(q)=\frac{m'(x)^2}{m(x)^3}. \tag{20}$$

With $F_1(q)$ and $F_2(q)$ are two smooth functions manifestly introduced by the ordering-ambiguity in (1) . Obviously, $V_{eff}(q)$ in (19) represents an effective potential field produced by the PDM particle itself (represented by the first two terms) and the interaction potential $\tilde{V}(q)\equiv\tilde{V}(q(x))$ . Let us now use the harmonic oscillator creation and annihilation operators

$$\hat{b}^+=G(q)-\frac{i\hat{P}_q}{\sqrt{2}}=G(q)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{d}{dq}, \tag{21}$$

and

$$\hat{b}^-=G(q)+\frac{i\hat{P}_q}{\sqrt{2}}=G(q)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{d}{dq}, \tag{22}$$

respectively, for a quantum particle with a *constant unit mass*. These operators satisfy the commutation relation $\left[\hat{b},\hat{b}^{+}\right]=1$ and imply that

$$G\left(q\right)=\frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}\Longrightarrow\tilde{V}\left(q\right)=\frac{1}{2}q^{2} \tag{23}$$

Moreover, the condition $\hat{H}_{q}=\hat{b}^{+}\hat{b}^{-}+\frac{1}{2}=\hat{b}^{-}\hat{b}^{+}-\frac{1}{2}$ implies that

$$\hat{H}_{q}=-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{q}^{2}+G\left(q\right)^{2}=-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{q}^{2}+\frac{1}{2}q^{2}.$$

If the classical Hamiltonian in (14) (along with $V\left(q\right)$ of (17)) is to find its quantum mechanical counterpart in (18) (along with $V_{eff}\left(q\right)$ of (19) and (23)) then the first two terms of the effective potential in (19) should vanish identically to yield $b=-1/4$ and $a=-1/4$ (i.e., Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's [4] ordering parametric set). Using the substitution $\varphi\left(q\right)=m\left(x\right)^{-1/4}\psi\left(x\right)$ in $\hat{H}_{q}\varphi\left(q\right)=E\varphi\left(q\right)$, one may easily show that

$$\hat{H}_{q}=-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{q}^{2}+\frac{1}{2}q^{2}\Longrightarrow\hat{H}=-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m}}\partial_{x}\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\partial_{x}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m}}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\int^{x}\sqrt{m\left(u\right)}du\right)^{2}.$$

Which is indeed in exact accord with Hamiltonian (10). This result not only shows that one unique quantum PDM oscillator's Hamiltonian is obtained but also exactly represents the quantum mechanical correspondence of the classical PDM harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian given here in (10) (and in Cruz et al.'s [1] equation (5)).

Hereby, a question of delicate nature arises in the process as to whether such a parametric set is only associated to the PDM harmonic oscillator problem. One would therefore invest similar procedure in a different model to test it. This is done in the following section.

## IV. QUASI-FREE PDM-PARTICLE; CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM CORRESPONDENCE

Consider a free PDM quantum particle (i.e., $V\left(x\right)=0$)) moving under the influence of its own PDM-field (hence quasi-free PDM-particle) [3, 7]. Next, using the point canonical transformation (12) along with the substitutions $\psi\left(x\right)=m\left(x\right)^{1/4}\varphi\left(q\right)$ and $\tilde{V}\left(x\right)=0$ in $\hat{H}\psi\left(x\right)=E\psi\left(x\right)$, then $\hat{H}$ of (1) would transform into $\hat{H}_{q}$ so that

$$\hat{H}_{q}=-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{q}^{2}+V_{eff}\left(q\left(x\right)\right)=\frac{1}{2}\hat{P}_{q}^{2}+V_{eff}\left(q\right), \tag{24}$$

where,

$$V_{eff}\left(q\right)=V_{eff}\left(q\left(x\right)\right)=\frac{1}{8}\left(1+2k\right)F_{1}\left(q\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{9}{16}+j\left(j+k+1\right)+k\right]F_{2}\left(q\right), \tag{25}$$

Now consider the classical Hamiltonian for a free PDM-particle moving under the influence of its own PDM-field

$$\mathcal{H}_{x}.=\frac{p_{x}^{2}}{2m\left(x\right)}=\frac{1}{2}m\left(x\right)\dot{x}^{2}\ ;\ \dot{x}=\frac{dx}{dt}. \tag{26}$$

Which, under the PCT would be transformed into $\mathcal{H}_{q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{q}=\frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^{2}. \tag{27}$$

The transformed Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{q}$ represents a free particle with a *constant unit mass* moving in $q$-space with a conserved momentum

$$P_{q}=\dot{q}\longrightarrow\dot{q}\left(x\right)=\dot{q}\left(x_{0}\right). \tag{28}$$

(cf., e.g., Mazharimousavi and Mustafa [3] for more details on this issue). Under such settings, we recast $\mathcal{H}_{q}$ to read

$$\mathcal{H}_{q}=\frac{1}{2}P_{q}^{2}. \tag{29}$$

If the quantum mechanical Hamiltonian in (24) is to correspond to the classical Hamiltonian in (29), then the two terms of the effective potential in (25) should vanish identically. That is,

$$(1+4b)=0 \text{ , and } \frac{9}{16}+a\,(a+2b+1)+2b=0, \tag{30}$$

which would, again, immediately suggest that $b=a=-1/4$ (i.e., Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's [4] ordering-ambiguity parametric set).

## V. CONCLUSION

As long as Cruz et al.'s [1] work is concerned, we have pointed out their unfortunate results and gave the corrected ones. Luckily, they have used $\hat{H}^{+}$ (5) and the corresponding $V^{\,+}(x)$ (7) (both were correctly obtained, unlike $\hat{H}^{-}$ (6) and the corresponding $V^{\,-}(x)$ (7) corrected above) in the rest of their methodical proposal. Therefore, one just needs to remove the 1/2 shift in their $\hat{H}^{+}$ and the corresponding $V^{+}(x)$ to obtain the correct unique representation of the quantum PDM harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian in (10) and the corresponding potential as the second term of (10).

For so many years, the ordering-ambiguity in the kinetic energy operator of von Roos PDM-Hamiltonian (2) has inspired research activities few of which were in the direction of fixing the ordering-ambiguity problem (cf., e.g., [1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15]) . In this work, we have used the quantum position-dependent mass harmonic oscillator along with commutation relation $[\hat{A}^{-},\hat{A}^{+}]=1$ and the complementary relation $\hat{H}=\hat{A}^{+}\hat{A}^{-}+\frac{1}{2}=\hat{A}^{-}\hat{A}^{+}-\frac{1}{2}$ to show that the harmonic oscillator PDM-Hamiltonian in (10) is unique and represented by

$$\hat{H}=-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m(x)}}\partial_x\frac{1}{\sqrt{m(x)}}\partial_x\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m(x)}}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\int^{x}\sqrt{m(u)}du\right)^{2}. \tag{31}$$

Unlike the claimed arbitrariness in the quantum PDM oscillator reported by Cruz et al.'s [1]. This result not only shows that one unique quantum PDM oscillator's Hamiltonian is obtained but also exactly represents the quantum mechanical correspondence of the classical PDM harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian (documented in section III). Moreover, we have reported that such unique representation of the PDM kinetic energy term of (31) is not only a by-product of the quantum PDM oscillator, but also a by-product of the quantum mechanical correspondence of the classical PDM-oscillator as well as classical quasi-free PDM Hamiltonians (documented in sections III and IV). In fact, one may go further and conjecture, from both PCT-transformed harmonic oscillator and quasi-free PDM-Hamiltonians, that such unique representation holds true also for any potential $V(x)$ (which would PCT-transform into $V(q(x))=V(q)$ leaving the first two terms of the effective potential (19) to vanish identically).

In short, the examples discussed above show that the classical and quantum mechanical correspondence leaves no doubt that the kinetic energy operator in the von Roos Hamiltonian now finds its *unique* representation through Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's [4] ordering-ambiguity parametric set to read

$$\hat{T}_x=-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m(x)}}\partial_x\frac{1}{\sqrt{m(x)}}\partial_x\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{m(x)}}. \tag{32}$$

This should very likely settle down the ordering-ambiguity conflict.

---

[1] S. Cruz y Cruz, J Negro, L. M. Nieto, Phys. Lett. **A 369** (2007) 400.
[2] O. Von Roos, Phys. Rev. **B 27** (1983) 7547.
[3] S H Mazharimousavi, O Mustafa, arXiv: 1208.1095
[4] O Mustafa, S.Habib Mazharimousavi, Int. J. Theor. Phys **46** (2007) 1786.
[5] S. Cruz y Cruz, O Rosas-Ortiz, J Phys **A**: Math. Theor. **42** (2009) 185205.
[6] A de Souza Dutra, C A S Almeida, Phys Lett. **A 275** (2000) 25.
[7] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 358** (2006) 259.
[8] A D Alhaidari, Phys. Rev. **A 66** (2002) 042116.
[9] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **39** (2006) 10537.
[10] B Bagchi, A Banerjee, C Quesne, V M Tkachuk, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Gen. **38** (2005) 2929.
[11] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 357** (2006) 295.

[12] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, J Phys **A:** Math. Theor.**41 (**2008**)** 244020.
[13] R Koc, G Sahinoglu, M Koca, Eur. Phys. J. **B48** (2005) 583.
[14] B. Bagchi, P. Gorain, C. Quesne and R. Roychoudhury, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A19** (2004) 2765
[15] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 373** (2009) 325.
[16] O. Mustafa, J Phys **A:** Math. Theor.**43 (**2010**)** 385310.
[17] O. Mustafa, J Phys **A:** Math. Theor.**44 (**2011**)** 355303.